1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
2	EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK			
3	WINDWARD BORA LLC, . Docket No 20-cv-05320-DG-MMH			
4	Plaintiff, .			
5	v. Brooklyn, New York Tuesday, December 14, 2021			
6	IRA THOMAS, et al., 10:13 a.m.			
7	Defendants			
8				
9				
10	TRANSCRIPT OF A TELEPHONIC MOTION HEARING BEFORE THE HONORABLE MARCIA M. HENRY UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE			
11				
12	APPEARANCES:			
13	For the Plaintiff: The Margolin & Weinreb Law Group, LLP			
14	ALYSSA L. KAPNER, ESQ. 165 Eileen Way Suite 101			
15	Syosset, New York 11791 516-945-6055			
16				
17				
18	Transcription Service: Opti-Script, Inc. P.O. Box 77			
19	Winfield, PA 17889			
20	800-494-7500			
21	Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording;			
22	transcript produced by transcription service.			
23				
24				
25				

	2
1	PROCEEDINGS
2	THE CLERK: Good morning. This is a civil cause
3	for a motion hearing for case number 20-cv-5320, Windward
4	Bora LLC v. Thomas, et al.
5	As a reminder, pursuant to Local Civil Rule 1.8,
6	the parties may not independently record any court
7	proceedings. A transcript of this proceeding may be ordered
8	from the clerk's office.
9	That being said, counsel for Plaintiff, please
10	state your appearance for the record.
11	MS. KAPNER: Good morning, Your Honor. My name is
12	Alyssa Kapner from The Margolin & Weinreb Law Group for the
13	Plaintiff, Windward Bora LLC, and I have this morning filed a
14	notice for appearance on the docket.
15	THE COURT: Good morning, Ms. Kapner. I have seen
16	your notice of appearance, so thank you for that.
17	THE CLERK: And there is no appearance for the
18	Defendants, Judge.
19	THE COURT: For either Defendant?
20	THE CLERK: That's correct.
21	THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much.
22	All right. So Ms. Kapner, we are here on a motion

23

24

25

Opti-Script, Inc. | 800-494-7500 P.O. Box 77, Winfield, PA 17889

The complaint was filed on November 3rd of 2020,

for default judgment. And let me just do a quick recap of my

production@opti-script.com

understanding of the procedural history of this case.

essentially requesting to foreclose on a mortgage for a property in Queens. There were a couple of affidavit for affirmations that were filed with the complaint regarding compliance with various foreclosure-related moratoriums that were issued by New York State, as well as the federal government, and I will return to those later when we get to the substance of the motion.

As I see here, the case had originally been assigned to Judge Cogan and then subsequently was reassigned to Judge Gujarati, who's the currently assigned District Judge. Similarly, Judge Bulsara had been assigned to the case and then it was subsequently reassigned to me.

Now, I do see two returned summonses executed on -- as of December 23rd -- yes -- of 2020, at docket numbers 11 and 12, as to both Defendant Ira Thomas and then Defendant New York City Environmental Control Board who we'll just call ECB for the purposes of this proceeding.

And then subsequently there was a request for a certificate of default as to both Defendants, and that -- now interestingly, in February of 2021, ECB filed a notice of appearance and counsel is listed on the docket. That counsel has not appeared today. And again, Ms. Kapner, I'll return to that subject to ask you a little bit about any interactions you may have had with counsel.

In any event, the clerk's entry of default was

filed on April 16th of 2021, at docket number 17, and then
the motion for default was filed on September 21st of 2021.

3 That motion was referred to me by Judge Gujarati for a report

4 and recommendations on September 22nd of 2021.

And I subsequently issued a notice for this hearing and specifically sent that notice to Defendant Thomas at not only the address in Queens that is the subject of this foreclosure action but also to an address in Brooklyn that was part of the papers. And I do see that there's an affidavit of service for that notice of hearing that was sent to Defendant Thomas.

Have I missed anything in that procedural recitation, Ms. Kapner?

MS. KAPNER: No. That seems pretty comprehensive.

THE COURT: Okay. So I've had an opportunity to review all of the documents that I just rattled off and I have some very specific questions regarding many different elements of this motion.

I first want to understand -- again, because ECB is not quite in the same posture as Defendant Ira Thomas because ECB actually has at least appeared in this case. So have you or your colleague had any interaction with -- the counsel listed of record for ECB is Michele Mirro?

MS. KAPNER: No, Your Honor. We have not. This is actually a very commonplace notice of appearance. I'm just

looking at it right now from the docket that it's an appearance and waiver. So they basically are putting in the appearance so that they're notified regarding the sale to determine if there are any surplus monies at the end of the action that the ECB might be entitled to, so.

THE COURT: I see.

MS. KAPNER: Yeah. So they didn't file an answer. It's merely just so they get notifications of what they want to be notified of. So they're not contesting the action.

THE COURT: Well, that's interesting. All right.

That is a helpful explanation and I guess explains why Ms.

Mirro has not appeared today although, again, it's -- so that leads to my second question relatedly.

Is the intention that the judgment here and essentially all of the release that is being requested is being requested as to Defendant Thomas?

MS. KAPNER: Yes. So as a little bit of, you know, background explanation, so the Environmental Control Board has what we have determined based on -- we receive a foreclosure search before we start an action, and based on that it was determined that there were Environmental Control Board violations filed against the -- either the borrower or the property, which are subordinate to my client's mortgage. And I believe that those were attached to our complaint at the end -- yes -- it's page --

1 THE COURT: Yes.

MS. KAPNER: Yes. I see that. Yes.

THE COURT: Yes. There are several of them, and I did want to ask about those. Since you did bring them up, which I appreciate, I did want to ask about them because there are multiple violations for multiple Ira Thomases, and I guess I'm trying to determine which Ira Thomas is the operative one.

MS. KAPNER: Right. So the reason why we include all of those is merely because we are trying to cut those off in our judgment of foreclosure and sale. And it's really just for going forward if we have a foreclosure sale so that there is clear title for whatever happens after the foreclosure sale. If someone, third party, buys the property or if it goes back to the Plaintiff, it would basically wipe out any of the liens by the ECB that were filed prior to our action being commenced regarding the borrower and/or the properties.

So it's possible that not all of these are on the head, as we call it, of either the borrower or the property, but --

THE COURT: Right.

MS. KAPNER: -- we have to include them because if we don't include them then something -- you know, we might not have clear title in the end.

So only the ones that are actually applicable to the property at the end of the day will be, you know, voided if we get a judgment --

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. KAPNER: -- of foreclosure and sale and the other ones won't remain open.

THE COURT: No.

MS. KAPNER: Also, as you see, like the first two, which the first -- yeah, so especially the first two which are large amounts, especially relative. You see the other ones, 100, 25, so we need to make sure that those are cut off in order to get clear title going forward.

THE COURT: Right. And just for the record, in part because there's likely going to be a transcript made of this proceeding, the document that we're referring to is Exhibit F to the complaint, which is document number 1-1 on the docket and it starts on page 41. Well, the exhibit page F is at page 41 of 43.

And then page 42 of 43 starts the actual listing of the violations. And on that page -- yes, there are seven violations and more continuing on the next page. The first are against an Ira C. Thomas at 1136 Bergen Avenue in Brooklyn, but then the second two are against Thomas, Ira -- presumably, that's last name, first name at 146-35 182nd Street in Springfield Gardens, which is the subject property

of this action.

Okay. I just wanted to clarify because you were talking about a document and hadn't actually referred to what document -- where the document was on the docket.

Okay. All righty. This is very helpful background and I appreciate you addressing and anticipating any questions.

All right. So now what I'd like to get back to are the foreclosure moratoriums, which were referred to in document number 3, the COVID-19 Pandemic Affirmation, and I just want to make sure that I understand that this action complies with those moratoriums. So can you provide a little bit more background around that, specifically whether or not this was filed subsequent to the expiration of any applicable moratoriums?

MS. KAPNER: Sure. So as you may know, there have been many different moratoriums and many different iterations of notice requirements throughout the pandemic since March of 2020 regarding what Plaintiffs or law firms or services need to send to borrowers prior to actions and whether the moratorium applies, et cetera.

So in this case, at the time that the action was filed, the COVID-19 Pandemic Affirmation, which was filed as docket number 3, was the affirmation which was required at the time. So because we're in federal court, the state

moratorium -- the -- you know, the outright moratorium did not apply at this time and throughout this entire time. What we have been doing is if a borrower files or submits a COVID-19 Hardship Declaration, then we stay the case. But if not, then we don't.

So we served this document on the borrower prior to the action. And I just want to pull up the affidavit of service because -- yes, there is also the notice to the Defendant regarding the COVID-19 Hardship Declaration was also served on the borrower with the summons and complaint and other notices that were filed at the time the complaint was filed.

So that's basically how we've been proceeding is we serve the documents prior to starting the action, and if we got a response, then we would not proceed. And then it's also served at the time of the complaint and the same thing — the borrower has had an opportunity throughout this entire case, whether we serve them or not with it, to, you know, say that they have a COVID hardship and then the case would be stayed based on that.

And in this case we have not received any correspondence from the borrower. And based on where the borrower was served -- and we believe that he does not live at the property being foreclosed so that might be a reason why -- now, if it could be a -- it could just be another

property that he's renting out and not necessarily something
that, you know, he wants to have a -- you know, has a
hardship for. Maybe he doesn't have a hardship. And -THE COURT: Sure.

MS. KAPNER: -- you know, we don't know.

THE COURT: Sure. Okay. Well first, again, you are anticipating many of my questions, which I absolutely appreciate. Let me just chime in with a couple of loose ends.

So you said that the COVID Affirmation was served before the action. Can you tell me the date?

MS. KAPNER: Yes. Hold on. I just want to look at our complaint because I know in our complaint we weren't pleading that -- the date, but we should have it in our -- hold on -- COVID letter envelopes. Okay.

Yes. They were sent on October 2nd, 2020.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. KAPNER: Yeah. So I have a copy of the envelopes and they were sent by certified mail and regular mail. So you know what? Actually they were sent to the property address on September 30th, it looks like, and they were sent to -- so September 30th and October 2nd. So what we were doing at this time is we were sending that out and then waiting approximately 30 days -- at least 30 days before filing the complaint because there really wasn't any specific

- guidance or dates that were given by the state so we were -we sort of just were being as, you know, generous as we could
 and obviously, like, knowing that anything could be filed or
 declared at any time during the case.
- 5 THE COURT: Right. Sorry. Okay. Thank you. That 6 is also extremely helpful.
 - And then you made mention of -- when you said the affidavit of service, I think you were referring to ECF

 Number 11 --
- MS. KAPNER: Exactly. Yeah. Summons returned executed, yes.

- THE COURT: Yes. Which was the return executed summons that was effected on Mr. Thomas, and I do note that in that affidavit of service it indicates -- excuse me, that the notices required -- I'm going to say the full law because it's a transcript -- the Real Property Actions and Proceedings Law, or RPAPL, R-P-A-P-L, Section 1303 notices were also included with the summons and the complaint.
- I did not see those notices in the papers. Is that something that you can provide? Just so you know, I'm going to be asking for several supplements following this hearing.

 Can you provide copies of those documents?
- MS. KAPNER: Sure. That document is a document that usually our process server serves separately. So it's just like a form-like piece of paper that explains the

- 1 process of a foreclosure.
- THE COURT: Yes.
- MS. KAPNER: But it's definitely --
- 4 THE COURT: It's the statutory notice, yes.
- 5 MS. KAPNER: Yes.
- THE COURT: Yes. I would like to see the one -
 because many of the papers in support of the motion and the

 complaint include other types of notices, like the default

 notice and the 90-day notice, so I'd like to see the 1303
- 10 notice, as well.
- MS. KAPNER: Right.
- 12 THE COURT: Okay. Let's see what else.
- All right. So let's get into the motion papers
- 14 | themselves, and we can start at -- the motion, I believe, is
- 15 | docket number 18.
- One of the first documents is the Declaration of
- 17 | Regularity in Support, and if you have the document in front
- 18 of you, just let me know --
- MS. KAPNER: Yes. Okay.
- THE COURT: -- when you're ready.
- MS. KAPNER: Yeah. I do. Yep. I'm ready.
- 22 THE COURT: Okay. So this is document number 18-1,
- 23 | and it's page 2 of 3, and it's paragraph 4, which is that
- 24 | the -- this affirmation repeats everything in the Affirmation
- 25 | in Support of the clerk's entry of default.

It's preferable to include that information in this

declaration so that we don't kind of have to go bopping back

and forth between this motion and the motion that was made to

the clerk's office.

MS. KAPNER: Okay.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

THE COURT: So this is more of a practice pointer because it's far easier for us to look at the motion when everything is all together. But as I understand, whatever is in that affirmation is supposed to be incorporated by reference into this one?

MS. KAPNER: Yes. I mean, it's basically just reiterating that the Defendants were served and that their time to answer expired and seeking that the clerk enter default.

THE COURT: All right. Okay.

MS. KAPNER: Understood.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

The second point has to do with the next paragraph, paragraph 5, and this is actually a big concern of mine because in this declaration -- the Weinreb declaration, we'll call it, document number 18-1, paragraph 5 says that the affidavit of Yonel Devico -- have I pronounced that correctly?

MS. KAPNER: Yonel Devico. But yeah. I'm going
to --

1 THE COURT: Devico -- the member of Windward Bora, 2 the Plaintiff, that the Devico affidavit was sworn to on the 3 30th day of August of 2021. However, in looking at that 4 affidavit, which is at document number 18-6, I think, in the 5 motion papers -- looking at that affidavit at page 4, the 6 notary signature on that is dated August 30th of 2020, so. 7 MS. KAPNER: Let's see if I --8 THE COURT: Let me know when you're there. 9 MS. KAPNER: Yes. I see it. That was a typo. It 10 should have been in the year 2021 on the notary. 11 THE COURT: Right. The problem here though is that 12 that's the factual basis for much of your damages 13 calculations, as well as other assertions in the memorandum 14 of law, and so if the notary's signature is not valid then I 15 would need to have a new notarized affidavit to look at. 16 MS. KAPNER: Okay. 17 THE COURT: Now, given that, the other questions I 18 had were actual factual questions about the calculations of 19 damages. So to the extent that you believe that the 2.0 information will be the same in the revised affidavit, I do 21 have to ask whether or not there are any damages or amounts 22 due that are being requested beyond the period between 23 February 1st of 2020 and July 27th of 2021? 24 MS. KAPNER: Yes. So what we do when we calculate

that is we calculate it and then we send it to the client to

25

be reviewed and executed. So if we do a revised affidavit we might extend the date to whenever it's prepared.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. KAPNER: And as you may see in the proposed judgment order, which is docket 18-3 --

THE COURT: Yes.

 $\mbox{MS. KAPNER: } \mbox{--} \mbox{on the first page, the third}$ paragraph sets forth that X amount is due as of --

THE COURT: Yes.

MS. KAPNER: -- whatever the date.

THE COURT: Yes.

MS. KAPNER: Then on page 3 of 6, paragraph 3rd, again, it recites that. So that is the judgment amount that we're seeking, but when we, you know, proceed with setting an amount that for -- we called an upset bid, if we go to a foreclosure auction, amount that we would, you know, be seeking in order to be made whole, we would potentially add, you know, interest up until that date.

But you know, we can set whatever bid we want. You know, we can include whatever we want to include in that, but for the judgment itself we're just seeking the amount that's due up until the date in the proposed judgment.

THE COURT: Okay. And so, no, that does make sense. If I understand you correctly, you are going to get a revised affidavit. You may then extend the date past July

16 1 27th of 2021, up to the new date of preparation of the 2 affidavit. And then you request a judgment in that amount? 3 MS. KAPNER: We'll only do that if we're going to 4 be submitting a whole new motion because then the rest of the 5 motion wouldn't necessarily be valid, but -- so we can talk 6 about that. But as you see, we calculate the per diem, so 7 the daily amount --8 THE COURT: Yes. 9 MS. KAPNER: -- so basically, what we would do is 10 just add the amount, you know, from July 27th, however many 11 days times 22.02 to get the amount that we would be seeking just so it would be the most, like, up to date figure. 12 13 THE COURT: Okay. All right. 14 I'm just looking through my notes to make sure I've 15 covered all of the questions that I have here. Give me one 16 moment. 17 Okay. So what I have as the, I guess, supplement, 18 and this can just be a letter to the extent that you need to 19 explain anything and then attaching the documents -- a 20 separate exhibit, please, just so that we can keep track of 21 which documents are which.

MS. KAPNER: Sure.

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: So far I have RPAPL Section 1303 notices and then the sworn Devico affidavit.

MS. KAPNER: Okay. I think that just to make it

17

1 | easier regarding the affidavit, we'll probably just keep all

- 2 | the dates and the figures the same so that it doesn't, you
- 3 | know, confuse the proposed judgment order and everything else
- 4 | that we've already submitted.
- 5 THE COURT: Okay. That's fine.
- 6 All right. And how soon can -- how much time do
- 7 | you need for this?
- 8 MS. KAPNER: I mean, quickly, but I just don't know
- 9 how quickly my client can get back to me. So I would say by
- 10 | the --
- 11 THE COURT: I was going to --
- MS. KAPNER: -- end of next week?
- 13 THE COURT: Oh, I was going to give you until
- 14 | January 6th, but --
- MS. KAPNER: Okay.
- 16 THE COURT: -- why don't I have you --
- 17 MS. KAPNER: How about -- can we do December 31st,
- 18 | even though --
- 19 THE COURT: Well, I will tell you that I don't like
- 20 Friday deadlines --
- MS. KAPNER: Okay.
- 22 THE COURT: -- so let's do December 30th.
- MS. KAPNER: Okay. Let's do the 30th, okay.
- 24 THE COURT: Yeah. Friday deadlines, in my
- 25 experience, always lead to Friday requests to extend the

- 1 | deadlines, so the 30th.
- MS. KAPNER: That's a Wednesday request to extend.
- 3 Okay. So that's fine, 30th. Hopefully, I can get it back
- 4 | sooner, and if not I will let you know as soon as possible if
- 5 | we need more time.
- 6 THE COURT: Okay. That sounds good. All right.
- 7 Is there anything else that you wanted to raise
- 8 | with the Court or any issues or arguments you wanted to make?
- 9 MS. KAPNER: No. Do you want us to serve the
- 10 | supplemental documentation on the borrower, as well?
- 11 THE COURT: Yes. Because while they technically
- 12 | have not appeared -- I mean, the action is still ongoing. So
- 13 | at some point they're going to get copies of whatever
- 14 documents are filed by the Court anyway.
- MS. KAPNER: Okay.
- 16 THE COURT: So yes. Okay.
- 17 All right. Thank you very much for your
- preparedness today. It's been very, very helpful and very
- 19 much appreciated.
- 20 And if there is nothing else, then we are adjourned
- 21 for today.
- I wish you and your family a very safe and healthy
- 23 holiday season. And thank you again.
- MS. KAPNER: Can you tell Judge Briccetti in the
- 25 | Southern District how prepared I was.

1	THE	COURT: I'm sorry?
2	MS.	KAPNER: Judge Briccetti in the Southern
3	District last	week did not think I was as prepared as you
4	did, so	
5	THE	COURT: All right. Well, every judge does what
6	they think is	best. And you've answered my questions, so.
7	MS.	KAPNER: Okay. Good.
8	THE	COURT: That's what I have to gauge.
9	MS.	KAPNER: It's helpful to also be able to access
10	things if you	don't bring them to court, you know, if you're
11	at your comput	ter.
12	THE	COURT: Yes. I would agree.
13	All	right. Thank you so much.
14	MS.	KAPNER: Thank you, Judge. Have a good day.
15	THE	COURT: Bye.
16	(Proceed:	ings adjourned at 10:46 pm)
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1	TRANSCRIBER'S CERTIFICATE				
2	I certify that the fo	oregoing is a correct			
3	transcript from the electronic sound recording of the				
4	proceedings in the above-entitled matter				
5					
6		January 8, 2022			
7	Terry Rubino				
9					
10	Terry Rubino	DATE			
11	Legal Transcriber				
12					
13					
14					
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					